

**Woodburn 5<sup>th</sup> Street Improvements Project**  
**Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #4**  
**Alternatives Questionnaire Responses**  
**March 11, 2010**

**FINAL RESULTS**

	Alternative 1 Two-Way Traffic	Alternative 2 One-way Traffic	Alternative 3 No Build
First Choice	4	3	10
Second Choice	4	10	3
Third Choice	9	4	4

Total response received: 17

---

**3/11/10          Linda Wilmes-Smith**

**First:** Alternative 3  
**Second:** Alternative 2  
**Third:** Alternative 1

I don't believe dumping traffic on to Harrison Street is beneficial. It doesn't serve the purpose of increasing "connectivity" north or south as the City is trying to do. There will be a bottleneck at Harrison and that doesn't serve the citizens of Woodburn.

ODOT has not approved a light at 5<sup>th</sup> and 214 and they may never approve it. Why would you disrupt 5<sup>th</sup> street for a light that may never happen.

**Process:**  
Positive process, necessary for the citizen.

---

**3/11/10          Jaime Estrada**

**First:** Alternative 1  
**Second:** Alternative 3  
**Third:** Alternative 2

Very good traffic flow in all directions. Local residents can drive north onto 214 without too much inconvenience. They can also drive south to downtown without any difficulty. People who are not familiar with the area can turn around very easy at any intersection if they pass their destination.

**Process:**  
The process was very informative. The engineers can city staff did a wonderful job providing the information that committee members requested. The group was made of a very good cross section of the community.

---

**3/11/10**      **Jessy Olson**

**First:** Alternative 2

**Second:** Alternative 1

**Third:** Alternative 3

I think the 5<sup>th</sup> Street extension definitely needs to happen. As a representative of Nuevo Amencer and FHDC, we think it will improve safety and help with access and traffic congestion.

Even though it is not an option here, I think the Yew Street connection is a good idea.

**Process:**

Very fair process – great facilitation

---

**3/11/10**      **Mario S. Magana**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 1

**Third:** Alternative 2

I'm a member of St. Luke's Church. I am very concerned about the school students, since our school building lacks AC and we have no financial means to install it.

I strongly believe that most of the CAC members are in favor of the No Build alternative.

Alternative 1 would be my second choice because it is more practical for traffic than Alternative 2.

**Process:**

We need more time available for discussion.

---

**3/11/10**      **Caroline Sanchez Ruiz**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 1

Although aesthetically, this would be an excellent improvement project for the 5<sup>th</sup> Street homeowners, this is not, nor in my mind, will it ever be a fair or equitable exchange. The risk factors for safety, air quality, noise and P/U and D/O are all hugely impacted. This project in and of itself is a good one. I don't feel it's a good one for the residents or parishioners/students/families of St. Luke Church and school. My children's safety as well as that of all St. Luke school students, faculty and staff are of grave concern to me and my family. I see the number of fatalities and accidents that happen near schools and in congested/restricted streets and that is a chance I refuse to take or expose my children to. Please find an alternative street(s) for this project. There is no good reason to waste or discard all of your work, research and time you've invested in this so far.

**Process:**

I appreciate the opportunity of having my opinion heard and taken into account. Thank you.

---

**3/11/10**            **Christine M. Vistica**

**First:** Alternative 3  
**Second:** Alternative 2  
**Third:** Alternative 1

We have a school that I feel is the best in Woodburn (check our state scores), any build besides the “no build” will impact our school greatly. We are talking about our future leaders, our future “Dan Brown’s and Mayor Figley’s”. We have several routes to downtown now that can be used with proper signage and lights. We have 99 Park Avenue, and Settlemier. You don’t need 5<sup>th</sup> to have your light on 214 if that is what you want. You will be heading down to a “dead end” on Harrison and we really don’t have the money to help our school improve to offset these changes.

---

**3/11/10**            **Rob Carney**

**First:** Alternative 2  
**Second:** Alternative 3  
**Third:** Alternative 1

I believe that Alternative 2 offers the least distress to the residents on Harrison and 5<sup>th</sup>. I do not believe we should proceed with a two-way option and prefer to install a traffic signal at Meridian and 5<sup>th</sup> and not open the barrier before a more suitable solution is discovered.

**Process:**  
Very professional and effective.

---

**3/11/10**            **Anonymous**

**First:** Alternative 2  
**Second:** Alternative 3  
**Third:** Alternative 1

I feel that Alternative 2 would benefit the school and the church the best as it would cut the traffic in half and would give adequate parking. It would also help the 5<sup>th</sup> street residents with traffic congestion by splitting the traffic flow between 5<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>.

If the couplet idea is not chosen, I feel the “no build” will be my next choice because Alternative 1 will be too much traffic coming into and going out Harrison and 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Process:**  
I like it. The meetings seem to run smoothly. For the most part everyone could talk freely. I feel there could have been more work done on the other options.

---

**3/11/10          Tom Lonergan**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 1

I am for the no build option because of the disruption to the educational process at St. Lukes. I feel the school needs the windows open due to heat and air quality about 4 to 6 months out of the year and with the visual and noise distraction the 1000 more cars would bring to 5<sup>th</sup> street. This would be a major educational distraction. Also, I see more traffic congestion at the intersection of 5<sup>th</sup> and Harrison.

**Process:**

This was a very good value the city did a fin job educating us and giving us in formation on the project.

---

**3/11/10          Anonymous**

**First:** Alternative 1

**Second:** Alternative: 2

**Third:** Alternative 3

Alternative one provides the greatest level of improvement citywide. Most gain for residents/users equals best value. Highly favorable, moves traffic, provides pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access. The negatives can be addressed at the specific design phase

**Process:**

Useful but seemed to be to long, could have shortened it up. Excellent facilitator.

---

**3/11/10          Anonymous**

**First:** Alternative 1

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 3

Alternative 1 gives the most access to increase connectivity of the city. It will enhance vehicle access. It should reduce peak flows on Settlemeir and 214. Consideration needs to be taken to minimize impacts on private property.

Alternative 2: it works okay but It increases impacts on private property rights. It will increase access and connectivity of the community.

**Process:**

The process went well. I strongly believe that the city did a good job trying to get citizen comments.

---

**3/11/10            Ed Krupicka**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 1

**Third:** Alternative 2

Initially this project was presented as required to get a traffic light on 214. According to ODOT personnel, opening 5<sup>th</sup> street is not the determining factor. This will have a negative impact on the livability of residents in the area. This will have a dramatic negative impact on St. Luke school regarding safety, noise, distracting for students and air quality – all caused by the increased traffic.

Putting all the traffic on Harrison street will cause traffic congestion in that area. Efforts should be made with ODOT to put in the traffic light without opening 5<sup>th</sup> street.

**Process:**

The process did provide much more information than we would have had without the meetings. It also gave a good insight by the other committee members.

---

**3/11/10            Tom Welch**

**First:** Alternative 1

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 3

Projecting the inevitable increases in traffic, there seems to me no choice but to open 5<sup>th</sup> street – to provide additional routing options to both motor vehicle traffic and pedestrian traffic, especially onto off of 214, other than Settlemier or Boones Ferry Rd. Opening 5<sup>th</sup> to 214 and placing crossing signals, crosswalk at 214/5<sup>th</sup>, sidewalks and crossing controls along 5<sup>th</sup> to Harrison will address the current and future needs to traffic flow. Access to that part of town to emergency vehicle response will be dramatically improved. Some people/properties will see negative impact which (unfortunately) cannot be engineered out.

**Process:**

The CAC process is too heavily weighted with only 1 special interest group – St. Luke's School. The results need to be weighted to give more accurate suggestions to the council. We don't want this report to be deemed St. Luke's School vs. the City of Woodburn. Try weighting the responses giving each person only that amount of score they deserve – as it's towards row data would suggest no build was the recommendation but it is really not necessarily so, the majority of the CAC were imported homeowners and St. Luke's School only – all are emotionally compromised and not enough unbiased input came to the CAC meetings to balance the issues.

---

**3/11/10**            **Casey Robles**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 1 (with Yew open)

**Third:** Alternative 2 (north on 5th)

I support no build because I live there and don't see any way we can move any time soon. I think it is going to limit play space for children and create much traffic that will actually be dangerous for the kids that are used to playing there. I think cars will short cut through 5<sup>th</sup> and traffic speeds will be dangerously high. Two way street must have Yew open.

**Process:**

Good – at least my voice was heard here in the room. Hope we come up with something that works for everyone.

---

**3/11/10**            **Peppi Kosikowski**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 1

This will change the area where I live in a very negative way.

---

**3/11/10**            **Jerry Ambris**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 2

**Third:** Alternative 1

No build is my recommendation due to safety, distractions and parking. If traffic is extended to Morrison (needs resurfacing), 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (needs widening or other side streets (Fir and High need resurfacing)) – this could be a disaster. House owners do not want this, the school does not want this, and the church does not want this. During the CAC meetings the City has failed to convince me that the gains are great enough to disrupt community, families and church goers.

**Process:**

This process should be utilized as often as possible to hear the voice of those most and first impacted.

---

**3/11/10**

**Dave Christoff**

**First:** Alternative 3

**Second:** Alternative 1

**Third:** Alternative 2

I initially felt and still do that the most benefitted residents of W.D. were those living in and involved in the neighborhood. However, given the dialog from those most impacted and most vested. It is too emotional an issue and for that reason it would be politically impractical. It would be better to let the system fail than attempt to proceed with this.

1. Because not enough of the entire city benefits
2. Too much fear of the unknown
3. Too complex to grasp until it becomes more obvious in the future

Since those impacted the most do not perceive the value, I strongly recommend NO BUILD.